



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

now be taken by the American government and as a step toward the achievement of these four results that the other republics of this hemisphere be invited to confer with our own as to the law which they would be prepared to support in order to insure such concerted action as would be likely to secure due consideration for neutral rights and interests at the settlement following the present war."

These resolutions have been sent to President Wilson, to the members of the Congress of the United States, and to the Board of Directors of the Pan-American Union at Washington, D. C.

A. W. K.

## WHAT CAN EDUCATION DO TO FURTHER THE POSSIBILITIES OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION?

By PRESIDENT MARY E. WOOLLEY

**I**N THE face of the crisis through which we are passing, to speak of education seems like talking at long range. This is primarily the time for action—for determining what can be done *now* most wisely rather than for discussing the training of the future.

But from another point of view, this is also the time for education—a time when men and women and children need to be trained to think,—a time for education through every possible agency. We are living in an age of destruction on a scale more colossal than anything that the world has ever seen or dreamed—and not a small share of the responsibility for these awful forces of destruction which have been let loose upon the world must rest upon the teachers who have been defending and promulgating what Dr. Gulick calls "absolutely unhuman international ethics." If "modern Germany is the work of the schoolmaster" of the last thirty years, within the next thirty, within the next ten, the American schoolmaster can work out a very different ideal of civilization. Education has clearly marked out for it the path which it should follow. "This is the way; walk ye in it," rings in our ears as distinctly as if the fearless prophet of old were in our midst preaching "in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength." May it not be true of us, as of ancient Israel, "and you would not"!

The agencies of education are many, and in this critical time the resources of all should be utilized—church, home, school, public platform, club, educational, social and religious organizations, periodical, and last, but by no means least, the press, rightly called the great national educator. Many a reader of the daily paper must wonder why it does not always improve its unmatched opportunity for shaping and guiding public opinion along constructive lines; for example, in some of the critical periods through which we have passed in our relations with Japan, by substituting for the snapshot judgments of hot-headed writers who understand neither people, country, nor conditions of which they are writing, a clear-cut expression of opinion by a man like Dr. Gulick, who knows whereof he speaks. The newspapers of the country have an opportunity that is appalling, viewed in the light of the responsibility which goes with it, for forming public opinion aright.

A year ago many of us would have said that an understanding of the waste of war, a waste of material resources, of the achievements of civilization, of human life itself, would deter nations from plunging into its awful vortex. But the incredible has happened, with mad squandering of wealth and treasure and life so vast

that our imaginations cannot grasp it. No; the education of the present and of the future must be based not on expediency alone, although all the teaching of expediency is an unanswerable argument against war. "After all, the passions of men are the strongest force in the world," said the wife of a naval officer to me a fortnight ago, "and therefore war is inevitable." Human passions are strong, so strong that merely practical considerations are often as powerless before them as a dyke in the pathway of a tidal wave. Within the last fortnight we have been appalled at the strength of the passions that have swept over us, the passions of hot indignation over the ruthless disregard of the obligations of civilization and the rights of humanity. The only plane on which education can educate today is the highest—that in the realm not of expediency, but of ethics. The most effective blow that can be directed against the destruction called war is the blow aimed at the destructive forces which are the interwoven roots of war—ruthless ambition, jealousy, distrust, fear, suspicion, hatred, and all the ugly train that undermine character and make life a travesty upon the thought of man created in the image of God. Education should emphasize the *constructive*, not the *destructive*, in life. The worst side of the proposed military training in our universities and colleges—we are not facing that contingency in our colleges for women, indicating that there are still some advantages in being a woman—is in the emphasis which it would place on the wrong side. We cannot serve both the constructive and the destructive, prepare our students for the killing of their fellow mortals, and at the same time make marked impression by the preaching of the doctrine "ye all are brethren."

History marks the growth of the conception of human relationships—the family, the tribe, the nation. A new stress upon the *international*; a higher conception of what human relationships may and ought to be; relationships which are bounded not by the family, or the social circle, or the community, or the nation, or the race, but are world-wide—this is now the province and the mission of educators. The failure of the different nations to understand anything about one another's point of view, President Hadley called the pathetic thing about the European crisis.

"Before war, arbitration; before arbitration, conciliation; before conciliation, concord," said Count d'Estournelles de Constant. It is a great and inspiring task that is presented to the educational forces of the world—the task of leading in the understanding of other nations and races; replacing fear and distrust and hatred

by sympathy and co-operation and the spirit of kindness; expanding the theory of personal ethics into the theory of national and international ethics, nay, more, showing that any system of ethics which does not include the larger view is only half ethical, that "righteousness and good will apply to nations as well as to individuals"; aiding in the development not only of an "international mind," but also of an international conscience, an international heart, and an international soul.

"Happy are thou, O Israel!" might well be applied to this people in its leadership today. An idealist for our President? Yes, fortunately—for where there is no vision the people perish—but also a leader whose platform of peace by every possible means is the only practical one for a civilized age. The issue is clean-cut. Shall the slogan of this country be "Might is Right" or "Right is Might"? The world is having a tragic object-lesson as to the working out of the first. Does it appeal to thinking men and women as a success? a step onward in civilization? a progress from any point of view, material, moral, spiritual? Is the world a better, happier, more useful, more beautiful place today because of the practical application of that theory? Shall we follow blindly in the wake of a theory that would make brute force the dominant power in the world? War as a method of settling international disputes is a looking backward. Modern science, modern business, modern enterprise in its multiform expressions are not content to look backward. War is an anachronism in this age, when all the forces of civilization, improved methods of transportation and communication, common interests of business, education, philanthropy, social bet-

terment are combining to draw the nations of the world together.

Granted that it is difficult in this time of strain and stress to find a way out, there are few things worth accomplishing that are not difficult, and the very difficulty should serve as a spur, not as a deterrent. We have been told today by a business man that business men do not stop in the promotion of big business because there are difficulties in the way. Surely this is big business—the biggest business that civilization has ever had before it—and the solution of the problem is a challenge to every thinking man and woman.

I do not need to remind this audience of some of the practical measures possible—a future world peace league; as a present measure, non-intercourse, diplomatic and commercial, with a recalcitrant power; the utilization of the coming Pan-American Congress for concerted action on the part of neutral nations, and an effort to support and help, by every possible means, the womanhood of the civilized world, the women of the warring as well as the neutral nations, who, in the midst of their heart-rending calamity, have shown a solidarity in their protest against war never before experienced in the history of the world.

There are psychological moments in the life of nations as in the life of individuals, and the United States is facing such a moment not only as to its action in the present crisis, but also as to its policy for the future. Shall we follow in the footsteps of the theory responsible for a calamity unparalleled in history, or strive to realize the ideal of a "powerful nation really Christian in its international relations"?

## JOINING THE ISSUE

Controversy over a fact, affirmed by one side and denied by another, is known in law as an "issue." Taking up the two sides respectively is called "joining the issue." A great need of the peace movement in the argument with its opponents is first to "join the issue." The following self-explanatory letter, with a summary of replies already received, is printed with the hope that many of our readers will be stirred to add their wisdom to this process of "joining the issue." Any intelligent contribution to the problem, if not too long, will be welcomed.

THE EDITOR.

*Mr. A. N. Y. Militarist.*

DEAR SIR: I have read with great interest your statement, in which you say: "The peace prattlers are in no way blessed. On the contrary, only mischief has sprung from the activities of the professional peace prattlers, the ultra-pacifists, who, with the shrill clamor of eunuchs, preach the gospel of the milk and water of virtue, and scream that belief in the efficacy of diluted moral mush is essential to salvation."

Now, Mr. Militarist, I wonder whom you have in mind when you express such sentiments? I cannot believe that you refer to the "professional pacifists" whom I know, the men who have been chosen to represent the organized peace movement of America, those of the American Peace Society, for example, the society which has heretofore constituted about all there has been to the organized peace movement in America since its beginnings in 1815.

You will probably agree that there are self-reliant persons overanxious to parade their masculine views by laughing scornfully at us "pacifists." You will probably agree that if one calls another "spineless," "effeminate," "unpatriotic," and "dangerous," with sufficient emphasis, one gets rather cheaply the reputation in some quarters of having a manly vigor of intellect, of being virile, masculine, patriotic, and statesmanlike.

Of course I would not intimate that your motives could be of such. You are not concerned surely in promoting simply your own reputation. You are interested in promoting the cause of international peace. I note with pleasure that you intimate just this. To be sure, you insist that the peace must be a "peace of righteousness"; but there is no difference of opinion between us on that score.

You must be acquainted with the history of the organized peace movement in America. You must know that it does not advocate disarmament for our country, or any other wild scheme. You must know that our main assumption is, and always has been, simply that war as a means of settling international disputes represents a dying civilization and a civilization that ought to be dead—that war is a relic of a barbaric age, an insane, futile, and intolerable nuisance. You will probably agree with us that war must, therefore, pass away as has the code duello, piracy, the thumbkin, the screw, and the rack, and that this process should be hastened with all possible dispatch.